



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,406	01/05/2005	Lea Di Cioccio	263098US2X PCT	9919
22850	7590	04/03/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER RODGERS, COLLEEN E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2813				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/519,406

Applicant(s)

DI CIOCCIO ET AL.

Examiner

Colleen E. Rodgers

Art Unit

2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action responds to the Amendment filed 6 January 2009. By this amendment, claims 9-11 are amended, claims 14-16 are canceled and claim 17 is newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9-12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goesele et al** (USPN 6,150,239) in view of **Usenko** (USPN 6,995,075).

Regarding claim 17, **Goesele et al** disclose a method for transferring an electrically active thin film from an initial substrate of SiC to a target substrate, including the steps of:

ion implantation through a face of the initial substrate to create a buried, embrittled film at a determined depth in relation to the implanted face of the initial substrate, said thin film being delimited between the implanted face and the buried film [see col. 4, lines 24-29 and 56-59];

fastening the implanted face of the initial substrate to a face of the target substrate [see col. 5, lines 12-14];

separating the thin film from a remainder of the initial substrate at a level of the buried film [see col. 5, lines 15-25].

Goesele et al do not disclose thinning down the thin film transferred on the substrate, nor specifically wherein the ion implantation step is performed with a selected dose, energy and

implantation current such that the implantation defect concentration in the first 500 nm of implanted SiC is lower than 9×10^{20} atoms/cm², whereby a number of acceptor defects compatible with the desired electrical properties of the thin layer is obtained in the thin layer of SiC thinned to a thickness lower than 500 nm.

Usenko discloses a method of forming a thin film **111** on a target substrate **107** by delamination of a layer **111** from an initial substrate **101** [see Fig. 1]. Furthermore, **Usenko** discloses thinning the layer **111** [see col. 1, lines 58-61]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to thin the layer because **Usenko** teaches that thinning beneficially removes the worst quality part of the layer [see col. 2, lines 44-49].

Regarding the limitation wherein the ion implantation step is performed with a selected dose, energy and implantation current such that the implantation defect concentration in the first 500 nm of implanted SiC is lower than 9×10^{20} atoms/cm², whereby a number of acceptor defects compatible with the desired electrical properties of the thin layer is obtained in the thin layer of SiC thinned to a thickness lower than 500 nm, **Goesele et al** do disclose, exemplarily, that the thin film layer is formed to a thickness of 0.58 μm (580 nm), and the hydrogen concentration at the maximum (i.e. at 580 nm) is approximately 6×10^{21} cm⁻³ [see col. 10, lines 22-29], but do not disclose the concentration at a depth of 500 nm. However, these claims are *prima facie* obvious without a showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art) and *In re*

Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art in general conditions is obvious). In this case, there exists no evidence of record that the implantation defect concentration in first 500 nm provides unexpected results in the thin film produced. Furthermore, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. “Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” See *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claim 9, the prior art of **Goesele et al** and **Usenko** disclose the method according to claim 17. Furthermore, **Goesele et al** disclose wherein the ion implantation includes implanting ions chosen from among the following species: hydrogen and rare gases [see col. 6, lines 29-33].

Regarding claim 10, the prior art of **Goesele et al** and **Usenko** disclose the method according to claim 17. Furthermore, **Goesele et al** disclose wherein the fastening includes direct wafer bonding, which comprises molecular adhesion [see col. 5, lines 12-14].

Regarding claim 11, the prior art of **Goesele et al** and **Usenko** disclose the method according to claim 17. Furthermore, **Goesele et al** disclose a step of healing annealing of the implantation defects on the thin film [see col. 5, lines 15-17].

Regarding claim 12, the prior art of **Goesele et al** and **Usenko** disclose the method according to claim 11. Furthermore, **Goesele et al** disclose wherein the healing annealing is carried out before the separating the thin film from a remainder of the initial substrate, which is carried out before the healing annealing step of **Usenko** [see **Goesele et al**, col. 5, lines 15-25; see also **Usenko**, col. 2, lines 44-49].

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Goesele et al** (USPN 6,150,239) in view of **Usenko** (USPN 6,995,075) as applied to claims 9-12 and 17 above, and further in view of **Maleville et al** (USPN 6,403,450).

Regarding claim 13, the prior art of **Goesele et al** and **Usenko** disclose the method according to claim 16. Neither **Goesele et al** nor **Usenko** disclose wherein the healing annealing is carried out after the thinning down the thin film. **Maleville et al** disclose a method of thinning a semiconductor layer by formation of a sacrificial oxide, followed by an healing annealing step [see col. 7, lines 23-30]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a healing annealing step after the thinning process because **Maleville et al** teach that it heals the defects generated by the formation of the surface oxide layer and stabilizes the bonding interface [see col. 7, lines 23-30].

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 6 January 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, Applicants allege, on pages 4-5 of the Remarks, that **Goesele et al** in view of **Usenko** do not "suggest the precise threshold as recited in Applicants' claims." However, the Examiner has explained above why the precise threshold is obvious in view of the disclosure of **Goesele et al** as modified by **Usenko**. Furthermore, regarding the further combination with the teachings of **Maleville et al**, Applicants merely allege that **Maleville et al** fails to remedy the alleged deficiency of **Goesele et al** as modified by **Usenko**. However, as explained above, the combination of **Goesele et al** and **Usenko** is not deficient; therefore, the further combination with **Maleville et al** stands.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Colleen E. Rodgers whose telephone number is (571) 272-8603. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Landau can be reached on (571) 272-1731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew C. Landau/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2813

/C. E. R./
Examiner, Art Unit 2813